DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 288 354 FL 016 985

AUTHOR Rodriguez-Brown, Flora V.; Ruesta, Maria Bustelo
TITLE Attitudes and Motivational Factors in Second Language Learning.
PUB DATE Jun 87
NOTE 25p.
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Affective Behavior; College Students; Comparative Analysis; Cultural Education; Degree Requirements; English; Higher Education; *Language Attitudes; *Language Role; *Learning Motivation; Linguistics; *Second Language Learning; Spanish; *Student Attitudes; Student Motivation; Surveys; *Teacher Role; Teacher Student Relationship

ABSTRACT

A study investigated the role of attitudes and motivation in second language learning by administering a semantic differential measure to college students studying Spanish in three different tracks (linguistic, cultural, and bilingual, or native-speaker). The student's track was determined by grades and language experience. Findings suggest that students in each track have different attitudes toward the foreign language. The native speakers showed an "integrative" attitude toward the usability and need for the class. The linguistic-track students had a more "instrumental" outlook focused on the relationship of language to job opportunities. Students in the "cultural" track had a negative attitude toward the second language and anything related to it and showed a "rebound" effect whereby they reacted positively to anything related to English. The findings also suggest that attitudes toward language, the second language, and the second language teacher play a more important role in second language learning than previously described. (MSE)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED288354

Attitudes and Motivational Factors in Second Language Learning

Flora V. Rodriguez-Brown

Maria Bustelo Ruesta

College of Education

University of Illinois at Chicago

June, 1987

Flora V. Rodriguez-Brown

College of Education

University of Illinois at Chicago

P.O. Box 4348

Chicago, IL 60680

FL016985

Running Head: SECOND LANGUAGE LEARNING

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☒ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

F. Rodriguez-Brown

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Abstract

This paper deals with the role of attitudes and motivational factors in second and foreign language learning. Data were collected from College students fulfilling a foreign language requirement by taking courses in three different instructional tracks: linguistic, cultural, and bilingual.

Findings suggest that students in each track have different attitudes toward the foreign language. The bilingual students show an "integrative" perspective in terms of the usability and need for the class; the linguistic students have a more "instrumental" attitude (language is related to job opportunities) while students in the "cultural" track have a negative attitude toward the second language and anything that relates to it. These students' attitudes show a "rebound" effect whereby they react very positively to anything related to English. The findings also suggest that factors such as attitudes toward language, the second language, and the second language teacher play a more important role in second language learning than previously described.

Attitudes and Motivational Factors in Second Language Learning

Attitudes and motivational factors have been shown to play a crucial role in second and foreign language learning (Smith, 1971; Gardner & Lambert, 1972; Cooke, 1973, 1978; Gayle, 1981; Ralph, 1982). Gardner and Lambert (1972) indicate that affective factors, including attitudes and motivation, have statistically independent and significant relationships with foreign language learning achievement. In fact, these studies have shown that independently of their language aptitude, students who are highly motivated and have positive attitudes toward the target language are more likely to do well in learning a second or foreign language than students who are less highly motivated or who have negative attitudes.

Gardner and Lambert (1972) also made a distinction between "integrative motivation" -- when the learner wants to identify with the target group -- and "instrumental motivation" -- when the learner wants to learn the language for utilitarian purposes. According to these authors, integrative motivation is a stronger predictor of second language learning than instrumental motivation. The integrative motive includes positive affect towards the target language and target community. Moreover, Gardner and Smythe (1975) describe it as a motivational complex, including integrative orientation, a desire to learn the target language, positive attitudes towards the second language group, the second language, the second language course, and teacher.

There has been some criticism of the distinct roles of integrative and instrumental motives and the supremacy of the first over the second. In her study of 84 foreign students in an American university, England (1982) found

that integrative motivation may not be the only orientation for successful second language learning. In fact, she found anti-integrative orientations in some successful learners. The most constroversial point seems to be the learners' attitudes towards the target community and their desire to become a part of it. However, learners' attitudes towards the language, the second language course, and the second language teacher are less controversial.

From our point of view, these latter components are important and have an impact on second language learning achievement, even if the learner tends to have an instrumental rather than an integrative motivation. In fact, Smythe, Stennett, and Feenstra (1972) argue that there are positive correlations between integrative and instrumental motivation and that they are not independent.

A second language is compulsory for certain students in American colleges and universities, and even in some high schools across the country. Thus, most of the foreign language courses are filled with students who not only are at various stages of linguistic ability, but who also reflect varying attitudes towards the language, the course, and the teacher. According to the current literature on attitudes and foreign language learning, learners with positive attitudes towards the language will tend to do better than students with negative attitudes.

The present study examines college students' attitudes towards the Spanish language and the Spanish program in a large Midwest urban university, as measured by the semantic differential technique. This university has a two-year foreign language requirement for all undergraduate students pursuing a degree in Liberal Arts and Sciences. The unique program design offered by

the Spanish Department in the university was ideal for our study because it offers three different tracks to fulfill the language requirement: the "linguistic," the "cultural," and the "bilingual" tracks. The linguistic track is a traditional foreign language class in which the four aspects of language -- listening, speaking, reading, and writing -- are taught. The emphasis in the cultural track is on reading about and providing information on the Spanish culture. The bilingual track is for Hispanics who understand and speak Spanish but have never taken Spanish as a subject and who do not know how to read and write in Spanish. Students are placed in the linguistic or cultural track according to their grades in the first quarter of Spanish (101). Students with a grade of C or below are recommended placed in the cultural track. Students with a grade of B or above are required to take the linguistic track.

We hypothesized that there would be affective differences among these three groups -- linguistic, cultural, and bilingual -- in regard to the Spanish classes. Due to the fact that the grouping of students into the linguistic and cultural tracks is based on student performance in Spanish 101, we expected differences in aptitudes between these two groups. We included the bilingual group in the study in order to see whether attitudes as measured by the semantic differential technique would reflect differences between the linguistic group (more prone to having an instrumental orientation to second language learning) and the bilingual group (who, because they are Hispanic, will show a tendency towards an integrative orientation) in second language learning.

Method

Subjects and Data Collection

The subjects of the study were sixty college students taking the last quarter of the Spanish language sequence required for graduation. Seventeen students were enrolled in the bilingual track, twenty seven in the cultural track, and sixteen students in the linguistic track of the Spanish language sequence.

The questionnaire was administered in class during the eighth week of the spring quarter of 1985. In addition to the semantic differential for the nine concepts, the questionnaire included several multiple choice questions related to students demographic information and reasons for choosing Spanish to fulfill the language requirement.

Procedure

The semantic differential technique is a method of measuring the connotative meaning of concepts in what Osgood, Suci, and Tannenbaum (1957) called "semantic space." This technique includes attitude assessment among its applications. The semantic differential has been widely used both in sociolinguistic (Amastae & Elias-Olivares, 1978; Gutierrez, 1980) and educational research (Labhan, 1969; Sanders, 1969; Smith, 1971; Gardner & Lambert, 1972; Pizzini, 1979, Gliksman, Gardner, & Smythe, 1982; Nelson, Rodriguez-Brown, Garreton, & Weinstein, 1985). This technique has been proven to be especially useful in evaluating concepts relating to a particular program.

The semantic differential is a scale which consists of a bipolar continuum, with a negative adjective at one end and a positive one at the other. It is given in a questionnaire form, and the respondents are asked to rate a concept (stimulus) against the series of bipolar adjective pairs. For example:

CAR

good ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ bad

The semantic differential used in this study consists of nine concepts, each rated by ten bipolar adjective scales. The seven point rating scales measure the factors -- evaluation, potency, or activity -- that Osgood and his colleagues (Osgood, Suci, & Tannenbaum, 1957; Osgood, May, & Miron, 1975) found to be the factors that best measure the connotative meaning of concepts.

The scales used were the same as the ones used by Nelson et al. (1985) which were chosen from the pan-cultural scales recommended by Osgood, May, and Miron (1975) for subjects speaking American English. These scales were nice-awful, good-bad, and helpful-unhelpful for the evaluation factor, strong-weak, big-little, and powerful-powerless for the potency factor, and fast-slow, noisy-quiet, and young-old for the activity factor. The tenth scale, familiarity-unfamiliarity was used to identify familiarity of the subjects with the concepts.

The concepts were chosen to address affective attitudes towards the specific languages (English Language, Spanish Language), towards school and the Spanish program (Spanish Class, Teacher, Spanish Teacher), towards the

idea of bilingualism (Bilingualism, Bilingual Education), and towards the self (Most People, Myself). The concept of Bilingualism was included because it is connected with the idea of learning a language. However, in order to differentiate between the abstract idea of Bilingualism and the controversial concept of Bilingual Education in this country, we included Bilingual Education as well. We thought that there might be differences between the bilingual group and the other two groups in regard to these two concepts. The concepts Most People and Myself were included in order to check for group differences in the way students perceive themselves. We though there might be differences in self-esteem because of cultural differences between the bilingual group and the other two groups, and because of the way students are tracked.

Data Analysis

Different types of scores were used for the analysis of the semantic differential data. These measures were as follows:

Raw E (Evaluation), P (Potency), and A (Activity) Composite Scores: the means of the three scales for each factor. They range from +3 to -3, with +3 being the most positive pole for the scales.

Standardized E-Z, P-Z, A-Z, and F-Z Composite Scores: the E, P, and A composite scores are standardized using the mean and standard deviation for all nine concepts, and establishes standard units of measurement to assist in cross-group comparisons of deviations from the mean (Nelson et al., 1985).

Distance from the Origin (D-O): represents the distance of a concept from the neutral origin of the E-P-A space, an index of the richness of feeling for the intensity of affect. It is measured by the formula D-O = (E + P + A)

Cultural Instability Index (C-I-Z): the difference between individual polarization and group polarization. To facilitate comparison among groups, this measure is standardized to a mean of zero and a standard deviation of one. This measure indicates the grade of intracultural agreement (and, therefore, whether a concept is affectively conflictive or controversial) in the three different groups. High positive values indicate high intracultural disagreement.

The statistical significance of differences between the three groups for each of the nine concepts for E, P, A, E-Z, P-Z, and A-Z was computed through one-way analysis of variance and the Scheffe post-hoc test using the SPSSX statistical package. Due to the small N size and the fact that the Scheffe test is very conservative, we computed these significant differences at the .05 and at the .10 alpha levels. Simple percentages were computed for the initial questions in the questionnaire.

Results and Discussion

Questionnaire Answers

The results for the initial questions in the questionnaire are presented in Tables 1-3. Table 1 gives the percentages of age and place of birth for each group. The data show that most of the students in the sample (79%) were 18 to 23 years old, the linguistic group being older than either the bilingual or the cultural groups (37% being 24 years or older).

Insert Table 1 here

Although the majority of the students in the three groups is native-born American, 29% and 19% of the bilingual and linguistic groups, respectively, are foreign-born. This is in contrast to 7% foreign-born students in the cultural group.

As shown in Table 2, when asked for the reasons for choosing to take Spanish, 96.3% of the cultural and 68.8% of the linguistic students chose it to fulfill a graduation requirement while 64.7% of the bilingual group chose Spanish to learn or to improve their knowledge of the language.

Insert Table 2 here

The bilinguals' reaction to this question goes along with the objective for which the bilingual track was developed (i.e. to improve the reading and writing skills of bilingual students). In the same vein, the cultural group chose it mostly to fulfill the requirement. This is shown even more clearly by the cultural group, 81.5% of whom stated they would not have taken Spanish if it had not been a requirement. In the linguistic group 48.3% of the students also stated that they would not have chosen Spanish if it had not been a requirement, in spite of the fact that their aptitude for learning languages was high. As expected, 58.8% of the bilingual group students stated they would have taken Spanish even if it were not a requirement.

Table 3 shows students' answers as to a perceived advantage to know Spanish in the U.S.A. today. Bilingual students thought it was important and interesting which shows an integrative perspective in terms of learning Spanish well. In contrast, cultural and linguistic students (74.4% and 62.5%

respectively) thought it was useful to know Spanish, showing an instrumental rather than an integrative need to learn Spanish.

Insert Table 3 here

Finally, in ranking the reasons why students chose Spanish as a foreign language to fulfill the graduation language requirement, 41.2% of the bilingual and 56.3% of the linguistic group chose Spanish because they already knew some Spanish. In addition, 41.2% of the bilingual group chose it because they thought it would be interesting and useful to them. This contrasts with the answers given by the cultural group. Only 22.2% of this group chose Spanish because they knew some already, while 48.1% of these students gave as a reason for taking Spanish that they considered it the easiest language to learn. Table 3 also shows percents of students' ranking (first vs. fifth) of each alternative answer to the question, "Why did you choose Spanish?"

The analysis of this set of data gives us a picture of three different types of students attending Spanish classes. First, we find the cultural students unmotivated and, probably, with low aptitude to learn a language as shown by their performance in Spanish 101, in which they received a grade of C or less. The only function of their Spanish class is the fulfillment of a requirement that they do not appreciate, and that reinforces in them a negative attitude toward the language. The linguistic group, in contrast, can be seen as a group who already knows some Spanish, was successful in learning it, and who sees a need to learn Spanish for career or professional purposes. This group thus shows an instrumental motive to learn the language.

The bilingual group can be seen as a participant in Spanish classes for instrumental as well as integrative reasons. This group reports some knowledge and proficiency in Spanish and, at the same time, is interested in the language and find the language useful in their everyday life. They show an integrative motivation (Gardner and Lambert 1972) to learn the language.

Semantic Differential

Table 4 shows the composite and standardized composite scores for each factor, E, P, A, as well as the distance from the origin (D-O) and the degree of polarization (I-Z) for intragroup agreement per group, per concept. Table 5 shows significant differences across groups per concept.

Insert Table 4 here

The analysis of the semantic differential shows that although the concept Bilingualism is evaluated positively, in general, the students in the linguistic and bilingual tracks evaluate this concept significantly more positively than the students in the cultural track.

Insert Table 5 here

The standardized scores show that the bilingual track students evaluate this concept the highest.

In contrast to the other groups, cultural track students do not consider this concept as potent. In terms of activity no significant differences are

found among the three groups. Surprisingly, linguistic track students show more familiarity with the concept than bilingual track students. Bilingual students show more intragroup stability in their answers than either of the two other groups, the cultural group showing the lowest stability of the three group studied.

Data for the concept Spanish Class shows significant differences for the evaluative, potency and activity factors between the cultural and the linguistic track students. In general, the concept is evaluated not too positively but it is evaluated significantly more positively by the bilingual and linguistic track students. The latter students see the concept as being more potent and active than the other two groups.

Although the three groups show positive intragroup stability in regard to this concept, the linguistic group is the one showing a significant degree of polarization in relation to the other two groups. This means that more individual polarization occurred within the linguistic group than either the cultural or the bilingual groups.

In general, Bilingual Education as a concept was evaluated more positively than Spanish Class, but not as positively as Bilingualism. The linguistic group shows the highest intragroup stability in their rating of Bilingual Education. The same group considers the concept Bilingual Education more positive and more active than the other two groups. As expected,the cultural and linguistic groups are not as familiar with the concept as are the bilingual track students.

All subjects tend to evaluate similarly the concepts Teacher and Spanish Teacher. In general, the linguistic track students evaluate the term more

positively than the other two groups. For the three groups, the concepts Teacher and Spanish Teacher are equally potent and active. The intracultural stability is neutral for Teacher and more in agreement with Spanish Teacher.

In terms of the concept Spanish Language, it is evaluated more positively and perceived as more active by the linguistic group. The bilingual group see the concept as more potent than the other two groups. The bilingual and cultural groups show high intragroup agreement. Spanish Language is rated significantly more negatively on every factor by the cultural group. This group shows less familiarity and less intragroup agreement than the others.

As if in reaction to their negative perception of Spanish Language, the cultural group rated the concept English Language as very potent and highly familiar. The linguistic group also evaluated the concept more positively and significantly more active in relation to the ratings of the bilingual group. The bilinguals consider this concept less potent than Spanish Language.

In regard to the connotative meaning that the concepts Spanish Language and English Language have for bilingual students, it should be noted that bilinguals evaluate Spanish Language more positively and perceive it as more potent and active than English, although they feel less familiarized with the concept. In contrast the linguistic group sees English Language as more potent and better than Spanish Language, although the latter is seen as more active.

Intragroup agreement is very high for the cultural group, high for the linguistic group and somewhat lower for the bilingual group in regard to this variable. It is in the concepts of English Language and Spanish Language that the effect of the D-O variable shows more intensity.

In regard to the concepts of Most People and Myself, it is important to note that Most People is a more potent concept for the bilingual group than for either the cultural or the linguistic groups. The bilinguals tend to evaluate Myself lower than the other two groups. This may be related to the cultural differences between the two groups, the bilingual students directing their feelings toward other people rather than themselves. It seems as if they see themselves as part of a group rather than as individuals.

In contrast, linguistic group students see Myself as more potent and active than the other two groups. They show low familiarity with the concept Most People. Cultural track students, in turn, show a high degree of intragroup agreement with the concept Myself in contrast to their reaction to Most People, where more intragroup polarity is found.

While bilingual and cultural students show high intragroup agreement for the concept Myself, the linguistic group shows low intragroup agreement in regards to the concept Most People.

Although Myself is seen as potent and active by the three groups, the bilingual group evaluates this concept significantly more negatively than either the linguistic or the cultural group. This probably reflects some cultural differences in expressing feelings about one's self than a true perception of self from the bilingual group.

The analysis of the data shows that concepts which are not directly related to the Spanish class, such as Bilingualism, Bilingual Education and English Language are, in general, evaluated more positively than those related to Spanish Language or Spanish Class.

The linguistic group tends to evaluate all the concepts presented in a positive manner. They show a positive attitude toward the concepts presented in this study. Their answers show generally high intragroup agreement. In the case of the cultural group, there seems to be a "rebound effect" whereby a concept having anything to do with the Spanish class is rated as less good, potent, and active while concepts such as English Language and Myself are rated highly as good, potent and active. This seems to indicate a tendency toward negative feelings toward Spanish.

In general, the data show that the bilingual group has similar connotative evaluation to the linguistic group for the concepts Bilingualism, Spanish Class, and Spanish Language. The bilinguals' perception of Teacher and Spanish Teacher is closer to the evaluation of the cultural group than to that of the linguistic group. This indicates that there are some negative attitudes toward studying Spanish. It may be that the bilingual group feels they already know Spanish and they are not as comfortable with the type of classes offered, nor with the content and/or approach used to teach them Spanish, thus subtracting from their expectations of their Spanish class. The cultural group, in turn, feels they are taking Spanish just to fulfill a graduation requirement.

Bilingual Education is rated positively by the bilingual group, although not as positively as by the linguistic group. It may be that several of these students have been a product of bilingual education programs and relate the concept to their feeling of isolation experienced while participating in bilingual education programs in high school.

English Language was the concept evaluated highly and seen as potent by the three groups. It was significantly rated as more active by the linguistic and cultural groups in comparison to the bilingual group. This perception indicates that the three groups see the relevance of the English language in school and everyday life. The bilingual group, on the other hand, may not consider it as active as the other groups do because of the lack of functional use of English in the community and family environment.

Thus, the students reactions toward the questions and concepts described in this paper seem to diffentiate among the three groups of students in relation to their attitudes and motivation toward Spanish instruction at the college level. Findings from the study indicate that besides differences in aptitude, attitudes and motivation (i.e. integrative vs instrumental), there are other attitudinal factors which affect second language learning, namely attitudes toward the language, the second language, and the second language teacher. These findings have implications for second language program planning where tracking of students by aptitude levels is to be implemented. Foreign language teachers should realize that developing and/or maintaining motivation toward learning a second language and changing attitudes toward a second language are parts of the art of teaching and should be important instructional objectives in all second language programs.

References

Amastae, J., & Elias-Olivares, L. (1978). Attitudes towards varieties of Spanish. In M. Paradis (Ed.), The Fourth LACUS Forum (pp. 286-302). Columbia, MO: Hornbeam Press.

Cooke, M.A. (1973). Social psychology and foreign language teaching. Foreign Language Annals, 7(2), 215-223.

Cooke, M.A. (1978). A pair of instruments for measuring student attitudes toward bearers of the target culture. Foreign Language Annals, 11(2), 149-163.

England, L. (1982). The role of integrative motivation in English as a Second Language learning among a group of foreign students in the United States. ERIC Clearinghouse for Research in Education, No. ED222044, Washington DC

Gardner, R.C., & Lambert, W.E. (1972). Attitudes and motivation in second language learning. Rowley, MA: Newbury House.

Gardner, R.C., & Smythe, P.C. (1975). Second language acquisition: A social psychological approach. Research Bulletin No. 232, Department of Psychology, University of Western Ontario.

Gayle, G.M.H. (1981). Personality, motivation, and second language learning. Canadian Journal of Education, 6(3), 55-67.

Gliksman, L., Gardner, R.C., & Smythe, P.C. (1982). The role of the integrative motive on students' participation in the French classroom. The Canadian Modern Language Review, 38(4), 625-647.

Gutierrez, J.R. (1980). Attitudes of Chicano bilinguals to spoken Spanish. Indiana University unpublished manuscript.

Labhan, W.F. (1969). A minimal program for in-service science training. Elk Grove Training & Development Center, Arlington Heights, IL.

Nelson, F.H., Rodriguez-Brown, F.V., Garreton, M.T., & Weinstein, A. (1985). Bilingual teacher training and teacher attitudes. University of Illinois at Chicago manuscript.

Osgood, C., Suci, G., & Tannenbaum, P. (1957). The measurement of meaning. Urbana, IL: University of Illinois Press.

Osgood, C., May, W., & Miron, M. (1975). Cross-cultural universals of affective meaning. Urbana, IL: University of Illinois Press.

Paradis, M. (1977). The Fourth LACUS Forum. Columbia, MO: Hornbeam Press.

Pizzini, E.L. (1979). Utilizing the semantic differential to determine the effects of a cross-cultural experience. Foreign Language Annals, (12)4, 311-314.

Ralph, E.G. (1982). The unmotivated second-language learner: Can students' negative attitudes be changed? The Canadian Modern Language Review, 38(3), 493-502.

Smith, A.N. (1971). The importance of attitude in foreign language learning. The Modern Language Journal, 55(2), 82-88.

Smythe, P.C., Stennett, R.G., & Feenstra, H.J. (1972). Attitude, aptitude, and type of instructional program in second language acquisition. Canadian Journal of Behavioral Science, 4(4), 307-321.

Table 1
Age Groups and Place of Birth
Bilingual, Cultural and Linguistic Track Students

Sample	Bilingual n=17	Cultural n=27	Linguistic n=16	Total n=60
Age				
18-23 years old	88%	81%	63%	79%
24-29 years old	12%	15%	31%	18%
30-and over	-	4%	6%	3%
Place of Birth				
Native	71%	93%	81%	81.6%
Foreign	29%	7%	19%	18.4%

Table 2
Percent Responses to Questionnaire Questions
Across Bilingual, Cultural and Linguistic Track Students

Part I

Why did you choose Spanish?

Group	Bilingual	Cultural	Linguistic
Because it was a requirement	35.3%	96.3%	68.7%
Because I wanted to learn the language or improve my knowledge of it	64.7%	3.7%	31.3%

Would you have chosen Spanish if it had not been a requirement?

Group	Bilingual	Cultural	Linguistic
yes	58.8%	7.4%	18.8%
no	23.5%	81.5%	48.3%
don't know	17.7%	11.1%	26.7%

Table 3
Percent Responses to Questionnaire Questions
Across Bilingual, Cultural and Linguistic Track Students

Part II

Do you think it is an advantage to know Spanish in the USA today?

Group	Bilingual	Cultural	Linguistic
Not at all	5.9%	7.4%	0%
Not especially	0%	3.7%	0%
It doesn't matter	0%	0%	0%
It may be useful	11.8%	70.4%	62.5%
It is important	52.9%	14.8%	25.0%
It is necessary	29.4%	3.7%	12.5%

Why did you choose Spanish? (RANK FROM 1 TO 5)
Percent answers for rank 1 and 5 per group

Group	Bilingual	Cultural	Linguistic
I already knew some Spanish (A1)	41.2% 5.9%	22.2% 11.1%	56.3% 18.8%
I thought it could be useful or interesting for me (A2)	41.2% 11.8%	11.1% 11.1%	12.5% 12.5%
I thought it was a beautiful language (A3)	0% 11.8%	3.7% 70.4%	0% 43.8%
I thought it was important to know Spanish in this country (A4)	5.9% 17.6%	11.1% 11.1%	12.5% 6.3%
I thought it was the easiest language to learn (A5)	5.9% 47.1%	48.1% 3.7%	6.3% 31.3%

Table 4
Basic Measures Per Concept, Per Group

	Composite Scores			Standardized Composite Scores				Polarization	
	E	P	A	E-Z	P-Z	A-Z	F-Z	D-O	I-Z
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)
1. BILINGUALISM									
a. Bilingual	1.5	1.2	.8	.7	.1	-.2	-.2	2.3	-.5
b. Cultural	.8	.2	.2	.1	-.4	-.2	-.5	2.2	.6
c. Linguistic	1.5	1.2	1.0	.3	.1	.1	-.0	2.4	-.2
2. SPANISH CLASS									
a. Bilingual	.9	.6	1.1	-.0	-.5	.2	-.2	2.0	.6
b. Cultural	.2	-.1	-.2	-.7	-.8	-.5	-.3	1.9	.7
c. Linguistic	.8	.8	.9	-.6	-.3	-.1	-.4	2.0	1.1
3. BILINGUAL EDUCATION									
a. Bilingual	.9	.9	.8	-.0	-.3	-.1	-.1	2.1	1.1
b. Cultural	.6	.1	.0	-.2	-.5	-.3	-.5	2.3	1.0
c. Linguistic	1.3	1.4	1.0	.0	.3	.1	-.5	2.4	-.4
4. TEACHER									
a. Bilingual	.8	1.0	1.2	-.3	-.1	.2	-.3	2.1	.0
b. Cultural	.5	1.2	-.0	-.3	.4	-.4	-.3	2.1	.0
c. Linguistic	1.3	1.0	.8	.1	-.2	-.2	.2	2.5	.1
5. ENGLISH LANGUAGE									
a. Bilingual	1.1	1.6	.3	.2	.5	-.1	.6	2.6	-.2
b. Cultural	1.5	2.2	.8	.8	1.2	.4	1.3	2.9	-1.6
c. Linguistic	1.7	2.0	1.0	.6	.9	.0	1.2	3.0	-1.0
6. SPANISH LANGUAGE									
a. Bilingual	1.3	1.7	1.0	.5	.6	.1	.3	2.6	-1.0
b. Cultural	.6	.2	.0	-.1	-.4	-.3	-.4	2.6	.6
c. Linguistic	1.6	1.6	1.2	.4	.5	.2	.0	2.8	-1.0
7. SPANISH TEACHER									
a. Bilingual	.7	1.2	1.3	-.4	.1	.3	-.4	2.3	-.0
b. Cultural	.6	1.2	.0	-.2	.3	-.3	-.1	1.9	-.1
c. Linguistic	1.5	1.2	1.1	.3	.1	.1	.3	2.4	-.3
8. MOST OF PEOPLE									
a. Bilingual	.8	.7	.7	-.2	-.4	-.3	-.6	1.7	1.6
b. Cultural	.7	.2	.5	-.0	-.5	.1	-.1	1.5	-.5
c. Linguistic	.5	-.2	.4	-.9	-1.4	-.8	-.8	1.2	2.0
9. MYSELF									
a. Bilingual	.7	1.3	1.5	-.3	.2	.6	.9	2.7	-1.5
b. Cultural	1.3	1.7	2.0	.7	.7	.6	.8	3.1	-1.7
c. Linguistic	1.1	1.1	1.5	-.2	-.0	.6	.0	2.3	-.2

Table 5

Significant Differences (at $\alpha = .05$) Across the Three Groups, Per Concept

Concept	Factor	F ratio	F prob.	Significant differences between groups	
Bilingualism	- E	6.2	.004	C/B**	C/L
"	- P	4.6	.014	C/B	C/L
"	- A	1.5	.24		
"	- F	5.2	.008	C/B	C/L*
Spanish class	- E	6.2	.004	C/B	C/L*
"	- P	4.2	.02		C/L
"	- A	2.7	.08		C/L*
"	- F	1.5	.24		
Bilingual Education	- E	4.7	.013		C/L
"	- P	4.2	.02		C/L
"	- A	.2	.79		
"	- F	4.5	.015	C/B	
Teacher	- E	4.0	.024	C/B*	C/L*
"	- P	.2	.79		
"	- A	1.6	.21		
"	- F	3.3	.045		C/L*
English Language	- E	.6	.57		
"	- P	1.5	.24		
"	- A	3.2	.05		L/B*
"	- F	3.1	.055	C/B*	
Spanish Language	- E	6.7	.002	C/B	C/L
"	- P	7.6	.001	C/B	C/L
"	- A	2.0	.15		
"	- F	6.5	.003	C/B	
Spanish Teacher	- E	4.6	.014		C/L
"	- P	.1	.88		
"	- A	4.5	.015		C/L
"	- F	2.2	.12		
Most people	- E	1.2	.30		
"	- P	3.3	.04	C/B	
"	- A	.1	.92		
"	- F	1.4	.27		
Myself	- E	3.6	.034		C/B*
"	- P	1.5	.23		
"	- A	.6	.54		
"	- F	4.3	.02		L/B*

Note.
* significant at $\alpha = .10$
** B = Bilingual, C = Cultural, L = Linguistic